

T. Michael Childs. Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the Manuscript Collections at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. A Master's Paper for the M.S. in L.S degree. November, 2009. 71 pages. Advisor: Matthew Turi.

This paper repeated a 2004 user study of the manuscripts collections at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to assess the research practices of the university's scholars of the American South. The methodology was changed from a paper-based survey to use of a commercial online survey company, which offered the new study numerous affordances and advantages over the old. It eases making user studies a regularized archival task, an important aspect of user studies. Changing distribution methodology from mailed surveys to a mass email announcement and converting the survey from one media to another offered valuable lessons regarding online survey research.

#### Headings:

Archives--North Carolina.

Archives--United States--Use studies.

Internet Questionnaires.

Internet Surveys.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill--Archives.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Library. Manuscripts Dept.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Library. Southern Folklife Collection.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Library. University Archives and Records Service.

SOUTHERN FRIED RESEARCH:  
SCHOLARLY USE AND NON-USE OF THE MANUSCRIPT COLLECTIONS AT  
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

by  
T. Michael Childs

A Master's paper submitted to the faculty  
of the School of Information and Library Science  
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Science in  
Library Science.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

November 2009

Approved by

---

Matthew Turi

## INTRODUCTION

“This is the story of a failed user study...” – Paul L. Conway<sup>1</sup>

So began archivist Paul Conway’s report on a series of user studies he performed at the National Archives and Records Administration in 1990 and 1991. So too is this paper a story of a failed user study. But as one author put it, “We learn wisdom from failure much more than from success.”<sup>2</sup> There are good and valid reasons to not dismiss this particular archival user study, just as Conway persisted in publishing his report regardless of his perceived failure, because: “The methodology of the studies and the data ... should be of use to archivists, librarians, curators of special collections, and others who wish to understand the purposes and behaviors of people who seek historical information...”<sup>3</sup> So too does this study have many valuable, similar lessons to offer.

User studies in archives have been a historically neglected area. Archives have traditionally operated from an abstract, historical perspective rather than a user-driven perspective. British historian and archivist Ian Mortimer writes: “...the ways in which historians and similar researchers with a professional remit see archive services is something of a neglected area in the archival press.”<sup>4</sup> More recently, library science professor Helen Tibbo stated: “Archivists do not have a great track record in the area of

user studies, having gathered little systematic data about users....”<sup>5</sup> Christopher Prom, author of *The EAD Cookbook*, states: “Archivists have long complained that relatively little is known about how archival users seek information, interact with finding aids..., or approach archives and manuscript collections.”<sup>6</sup> And yet, any library or archive worth its salt needs to know its patrons in order to better serve them and to better serve the archive itself.

Serving users is usually given as the prime reason to study them. For example, archivist David Bearman wrote: “Among our basic principles is that we need to study users.... We need to know what they ask, how they formulate their questions, and what they believe constitutes and [sic] answer or we can't design systems and approaches to access that will work for them.”<sup>7</sup>

However, user studies can also benefit the archive as well its patrons. Archives spend money on materials and services; even donated materials take up shelf space that must be heated, air-conditioned, properly lighted, and supplied with electric power. Staff time and effort are required to properly process materials and create their system records. Proper collection development based on user needs helps collection development wisely spend their budget, and assures the best fit of materials to patrons. Librarian Lawrence Dowler linked user studies with appraisal and acquisition: “...better information about the use of collections will help archivists set priorities for processing and collections.”<sup>8</sup>

User studies have made recent gains in acceptance and use in archives. However, *Managing Records* author Geoffrey Yeo offers a caveat, “...consideration of the use of records should be one component—though not the only one—of effective appraisal.”<sup>9</sup> A richer understanding of the actual needs and preferences of patrons is indeed but one tool

toward better collection development and acquiring meaningful collections of materials. Knowing one's users can also enable better targeting of efforts to publicize and make known the archive's materials.

These various rationales behind user studies drove the 2004 master's paper by Matthew Turi entitled "Working on the South: A Statistical Description of Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Manuscripts Department's Collections." The heart of his paper was a survey targeted at academic scholars of the American South who were affiliated with the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, assumed to be some of the primary and heaviest users of the four major manuscripts collections at the university. Turi's study also hews to the idea of the primacy of scholarly use, referring to his target survey population as a "key component of the Manuscripts Department's target audience: academic scholars of the American South"<sup>11</sup>

To be truly useful, user studies must be ongoing, or performed at regular intervals, as patrons and their needs and interests change. Dowler asserts "The study of use over time will provide a periodic check, a kind of reality test, for evaluating the criteria for appraisal and the effectiveness of documentation strategies."<sup>12</sup> Archivist Paul Conway believes "Without direct and *continuous* [emphasis added] user evaluations, archivists can only suppose that their [users'] information needs are being met on a regular basis."<sup>13</sup> A single, isolated study of an archive's users is only briefly useful; its usefulness decays as time passes and the survey results grow older and further from the current realities.

To this end, this study repeats Turi's 2004 survey. To encourage Conway's "continuous user evaluations," surveys should be made as easy as is possible without

compromising their goals. It should be easy for survey respondents to receive and respond to the survey, as well as easy for archive staff to prepare, create, disseminate, collect results, and analyze the surveys. It is here that the methodology for this 2009 version of the survey radically departs from that of its 2004 predecessor. Turi disseminated his survey in a traditional method: mailing a paper survey to selected respondents, who then mailed back the completed survey. The 2009 survey was created, disseminated, tabulated, and analyzed both digitally and online. This new methodology was not without issues, and implementation choices distorted the data in noticeable ways. But even with its flaws, this study helps illuminate the advantages and ease of performing user studies online. In the final analysis, the advances in user surveys made possible by online survey tools may be the most important data gleaned from the rerunning of this survey.

Conway theorizes that "...archivists' continuing reluctance to develop a better understanding of users seems not so much to be a problem of will as a problem of method."<sup>14</sup> If Conway is correct, and the true issue is one of methods then the ever-burgeoning horizons of the digital and online realms offer a myriad of new survey methods to the archive and its staff. . Indeed, in a recent study by Krause and Yakel, they took a "...multimethodological approach..." where "...data were collected through Web analytics (transaction logs, user statistics, and search term analysis), content analysis, an online survey, and three in-depth, semistructured interviews."<sup>15</sup> Interestingly, computerized archival user studies have been foreshadowed as early as 1986: "A microcomputer at the reference desk, equipped with data base management software, could substitute quite well for a whole range of survey questionnaires."<sup>16</sup> Here, Conway

saw the future of user studies over twenty years ago, even before the arrival of the Internet.

The ubiquity of computers, now coupled with the ubiquity of Internet access offers new and more efficient means of performing user studies. Online surveys have been increasing in popularity due to the numerous affordances of being “born digital,” such as convenience, speed, timeliness, low cost, and ease of data entry and analysis.<sup>17</sup> - There are a myriad of easy-to-use online survey companies, if not a surfeit. A recent special issue by the American Evaluation Association on online surveys identified no less than 17 different online survey companies one could choose from.<sup>18</sup> Online surveys are not without their weaknesses, of course, and one study synthesizing 45 other studies, found “... web surveys yield a lower response rate of about 11% on average compared to other modes...”<sup>19</sup> No survey is without its pitfalls, but: “Improvements in web-building tools and the growing acceptance of respondents to online surveys have increased researchers’ preference for using web-based surveys compared to traditional ones.”<sup>20</sup>

## **METHODOLOGY**

The survey used in this study was originally designed by University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill alumnus Matthew Turi for his 2004 SILS Master’s Paper. This study reruns that survey and compares and contrasts the findings from then (2004) and now (2009). However, while the survey instrument remained virtually identical in terms of content, there were several differences in both the survey population and in the methodology. Turi’s study specifically targeted University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill faculty, research staff, and graduate students conducting research on the American

South. For the 2004 study, names were culled from departmental websites and those individuals were then sent a paper-based survey via campus mail. The 2009 study utilized an online survey composed and conducted through the online survey company SurveyMonkey.com. Turi's original survey questions were reproduced as closely as possible. The notable exceptions were the addition of screening questions (see below) at the very beginning of the survey, and not capturing a respondent's *primary* academic discipline (as opposed to *all* the respondent's disciplines). This omission did impact the data for one part of the analysis. In hindsight, an additional question should have been inserted for users to indicate their primary academic/departmental affiliation.

This survey initially attempted to invite the same types of scholars Turi approached, via an invitation to participate posted on various H-Net.org email lists. "H-Net: Humanities and Social Sciences OnLine," based at Michigan State University, is "...an international consortium of scholars in the humanities and social sciences that creates and coordinates electronic networks, using a variety of media, and with a common objective of advancing humanities and social science teaching, research, and outreach."<sup>21</sup> H-Net maintains a large number of email lists on specific historical topics that are used by various scholars to provide each other with items of interest. The lists were reviewed and 14 were chosen as appropriate for eliciting scholars of the American South, such as the "H-CivWar" list which is for those with an interest in U.S. Civil War history. See Appendix A for a full list of H-Net email list used.

Although H-Net seemed like a promising source for survey respondents, several problems resulted. The survey was opened to responses on the evening of Oct. 7, 2009 and it initially appeared the response was good. However, upon closer examination, it



was revealed that the majority of respondents were prevented from completing the survey by a screening question because they were not affiliated with the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and were thus outside the scope of this study.<sup>22</sup>

A second difficulty came to light due to the nature of H-Net's email lists. These lists are not open to the general public, and require those who wish to post messages to them to be members of the list. It was discovered that different email lists had different policies regarding new members. Some email lists *could* be joined and posted to immediately, but most required completion of a user survey, subsequent approval, and the passage of several days before a prospective member was allowed to actively participate (H-CivWar took more than a week to join, the longest). Proper planning could have avoided this hurdle had the groups been selected and joined well in advance. As it was, the survey announcement was staggered, with different email lists receiving the announcement days after other lists. This meant that certain email lists had more time and opportunity than others to respond to the survey before it was closed to respondents on the morning of Oct 21, 2009.

In retrospect, the H-Net email lists were not the best method for contacting only those scholars affiliated with the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. To extend its members an invitation to participate in a survey, but then restrict participation to affiliation with a specific institution makes little sense, as the H-Net members are too diverse a group. However, had the scope of the survey been expanded to include scholars of the American South regardless of affiliation, then using H-Net.org would be an excellent method to announce the study and invite participation.

When it became clear that the H-Net email lists were not providing the desired response set, an alternate strategy was developed. One of the advantages of the SurveyMonkey.com online survey system was the ability to monitor the responses to the survey in near-real time. This made it both easy and quick to determine the existence of the problem, and enact an alternate plan.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has its own mass email system. A request was entered into the system to send an email invitation to all university faculty and EPA non-faculty employees at the various schools of the University (see Appendix B for a full list). This was approved after several days, and subsequently sent on Oct. 12, 2009 at 8:22pm. Unfortunately, this email was *not* sent to the university's population of graduate students. This serious oversight suppressed the response set of graduate students, and was the cause of a definite skew in the data, as revealed in various correlations and analyses.

The mass email resulted in many more responses than had been received with postings to H-Net.org email lists alone. However, it also resulted in a survey population and response set that spanned many, many more academic disciplines than was encompassed by Turi's original survey. In the 2004 paper, "...the departmental websites of African-American studies, American Studies, Anthropology, Archaeology, Creative Writing, English, Folklore, Geography, History, Journalism, Music, Political Science, Religious Studies and Sociology were scrutinized to determine all likely recipients of this study."<sup>23</sup> These departments, with the addition of American Indian Studies, Economics, and Public Health, were the named choices listed for respondents to indicate their department or program affiliation(s). A comment field labeled "Other" allowed

respondents to write in any other affiliation not specifically listed. In the 2004 study, no respondent indicated “Other” as a department or affiliation. In the 2009 survey, the *majority* of respondents (65.8%) had a department or program affiliation of “Other”. See Appendix C for a full list. Clearly, Turi’s methodology enabled him to more precisely target his desired survey population. An additional screening question at the beginning of this 2009 survey such as “Do you study the American South or a related topic?” would have focused the resulting set of responses.

## **RESPONDENTS**

In this 2009 study, of 141 total responses, 94 completed the survey. The 47 incomplete responses have been eliminated from the analyzed data, as 46 were from scholars not affiliated with the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and one respondent did not agree to be a research study participant. Screening questions asked respondents if they voluntarily agreed to participate and if their academic affiliation was UNC-CH and ended the survey if either response was no. These respondents very likely came to the survey from a posting on one of the H-Net.org email lists.

The response to Turi’s study in which 155 specific individuals were sent paper surveys by campus mail, was 29 returned, giving a response rate of 18.7%.<sup>24</sup> Calculating a response rate to this study is more difficult because H-Net.org does not make available the number of subscribers to any particular email list (although one page of its website claims 160,000 subscribers total),<sup>25</sup> and there was no absolute way to definitively divide up the entire response set between respondents who came to the survey via an H-Net email list and those who came via the mass email to university faculty. Determining the

origin of a respondent's invitation to participate could have been easily arranged with the tools available on SurveyMonkey.com. SurveyMonkey.com offers the ability to give the same survey multiple "collectors," which are the URLs sent out to the survey population. With foresight, it would have been simple to differentiate whether respondents came to the survey via H-Net, or mass email, without even the necessity of adding a survey question asking the respondent that information.

According to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Information Technology Services (M. Bonnell, personal communication, October 28, 2009), the mass email survey invitation went out to 4,188 employees of the university. Based on that number alone, the response rate is 3.36%. The real rate is in actuality lower, as a number of survey responses were collected solely from H-Net.org email lists prior to the mass email being sent. Fifty-three responses were collected before the email was sent out. This leaves 88 subsequent responses, but, again there is no way to categorize how these respondents came to the survey. Subtracting those 53 initial responses lowers the response rate to the email to 2.1%, and again, it is in actuality probably slightly lower, as it is likely there were at least a few more respondents arriving via an H-Net email list posting.

Based on response rate alone, it appears to be a definite advantage to carefully target the desired survey population in this type of study, and also in approaching scholars with a paper-based survey addressed directly to them, rather than an online survey solicited via an impersonal email. However, Turi performed his survey utilizing traditional, albeit very time-consuming methods. His paper surveys had to be printed, folded, put in envelopes, checked that the name on the cover letter matched the name on

the envelope, and posted. Each six-page, hand-written response had to be deciphered and individually entered by hand into a statistical analysis program, creating the possibility of data entry errors. There is also the large effort of composing, structuring and wording of the survey in the first place. Undoubtedly, this took many hours. This 2009 survey took advantage of the numerous affordances of online technology, and yielded a more time efficient survey.

That it is much easier to run an existing survey than to create one from scratch may seem a superficial and trivial point, but ease of reuse is important if a survey is to be run regularly. This 2009 study spent less than a single work day in total cutting and pasting the original survey into SurveyMonkey.com, setting answer parameters, adding “logic,” (the ability to skip questions or go to different questions based on a respondent’s answers) and testing it. Once in the SurveyMonkey.com system, the survey can be adjusted easily, swiftly, and the changes implemented immediately. The entire survey can be duplicated and altered as needed, or a single question tweaked.

Another important difference between this 2009 survey and its 2004 predecessor is that no time was spent deciphering handwritten responses or manually processing and entering data. Respondents responded online directly into the electronic version of the survey where data was tabulated instantly. SurveyMonkey.com provided tools for correlating, filtering, creating graphs and charts, and downloading data from individual questions or the entire set in a variety of formats.

## SURVEY QUESTIONS

To be able to best compare the past and present data sets, no changes were made to the content of the original 2004 survey instrument (See Appendix E for the entire survey instrument). However, two screening questions were added to the beginning. One was an instrument of consent, requiring a simple yes or no to the question “I agree to be a participant in this research study.” Respondents who answered no were not permitted to take the survey and were routed to a page thanking them for their time. The next question was “I am affiliated with the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,” which also required a simple yes or no, and if responded to with no, permitted them to go no further, and routed them to a page thanking them for their time.

A more significant alteration, which was thought to be unimportant at the time, was the loss of capturing a responding scholar’s *primary* department or program affiliation(s), as opposed to *all* of their department or program affiliation(s). Turi’s paper-based survey made it simple for scholars to indicate both within the same question by checking all affiliations and then circling their primary. As it was not possible to capture both pieces of data within the same question electronically, primary affiliation was dropped. This proved to be a mistake, and made it difficult to accurately compare the data between the 2004 and 2009 surveys for the analyses involving affiliation.

The survey questions dealing with familiarity and use of the various campus research collections includes the choice “Manuscripts Department.” It must be noted that in 2004, this was an organizational entity, acting as a sort of umbrella for the Southern Historical Collection, the Southern Folklife Collection, the General and Literary Manuscripts, and the University Archives. In June of 2008, the Manuscripts Department

was officially disbanded, and it no longer exists. However, it was determined to keep the term “Manuscripts Department” as a selection choice in the survey. This administrative change happened only recently, and many visible elements of the old name such as building signs and letterheads have yet to be updated. To many users, it is still likely best known as the “Manuscripts Department.” In addition, some collection users may have used one of the collections, but not realized it came from a specific collection. So in order to capture use as completely as possible, the term “Manuscripts Department” has been retained in all questions covering collection familiarity and use. In this study, the term “manuscripts collections” is used instead when referring collectively to the Southern Historical Collection, the Southern Folklife Collection, the General and Literary Manuscripts, and the University Archives.

## **FINDINGS**

The more unfocused survey population of this 2009 survey resulted in a much different respondent set. The most apparent difference is the clear majority (62.7%) of respondents who selected “Other” for their departmental or program affiliation. In 2004, no respondents chose “Other”. Only 58.8% of the listed departmental and program affiliations were represented in the 2009 survey. In 2004, this figure was 70.6%. Despite the broader survey pool, respondents came from fewer departments in 2009. There were zero responses for departmental affiliations of: American Indian Studies, Archaeology, Creative Writing, Economics, Geography, Music, and Political Science. The many wide and varied responses listed under “Other” ranged from Exercise and Sport Science to

Dramatic Art to Astronomy. The majority came from the so-called hard sciences and not the liberal arts (see Appendix C for a full list).

In Turi's 2004 study, the respondent percentages for graduate students and faculty members were nearly equal; with 48.4% faculty and 51.6% graduate students.<sup>27</sup> In this study, the respondent percentages for graduate students and faculty were very different; comprising 66.3% faculty and 33.7% graduate students. This is due to one of the problems with the survey methodology. The mass email was sent out to "Faculty" and "EPA Non-faculty employees," but unfortunately *not* to the graduate student population. Penetration of the mass email into the graduate student population appeared to be limited to only graduate students with University-affiliated jobs, as all graduate students respondents were either teaching assistants or research assistants.

**Table 1: All Survey Respondents by Department Affiliation and Academic Status**

Department	% of total R	Total # R	Faculty	% of F	Grad	% of G
African-American Studies	1.2%	1	1	1.8%	0	0%
American Studies	2.4%	2	1	2.8%	1	3.6%
American Indian Studies	0%	0	-	-	-	-
Anthropology	1.2%	1	1	2.8%	0	0%
Archaeology	0%	0	-	-	-	-
Creative Writing	0%	0	-	-	-	-
Economics	0%	0	-	-	-	-
English	7.2%	6	3	8.3%	3	0.5%
Folklore	1.2%	1	1	2.8%	0	0%
Geography	0%	0	-	-	-	-
History	8.4%	7	2	5.6%	5	31.3%
Journalism	2.4%	2	2	5.6%	0	0%
Music	0%	0	-	-	-	-
Political Science	0%	0	-	-	-	-
Public Health	9.6%	8	6	16.7%	2	7.1%
Religious Studies	1.2%	1	1	2.8%	0	0%
Sociology	2.4%	2	1	1.8%	1	3.6%
Other (please specify)	62.7%	52	36	65.5%	16	57.1%
	100%	83	55		28	
			66.27%	116.3%	33.7%	103.2%

F=Faculty G=Graduate Student R=all Respondents



For the 2009 study, use was captured by the question: “Have you used primary source materials from the following research collections in your most recent research project?” The survey was also designed to determine the recency of that use by asking: “Was your most recent research project completed over two years ago?” In 2004, 89.7% of respondents’ research projects had been completed within the last two years. In 2009, it was 92.2 %.

In 2004, 55.2% of the respondents indicated they had used Manuscript Department materials in their most recent research project, and 44.8% had not. In the 2009 survey, 25% of respondents indicated that they used one or more of the manuscripts collections in their most recent project, and 75% had not. This apparent drop in use is due to the number of respondents whose academic discipline falls outside of the ones expected in this study. Those respondents who selected “Other” for their discipline had a manuscript collections use rate far below that of the respondents who fell under the listed departments. For respondents selecting “Other”, only 5.1% used a manuscript collection in their most recent research project, and a whopping 94.9% did not. The use rate for the listed disciplines alone showed 61.9% used manuscript collections in their most recent research project, and 38.1% did not.

The use of *any* primary source materials by respondents in the “Other” category is very low; with 9.6% reporting using such materials from any of the listed research collections in their most recent research project, and only 3.8% specifically using the Manuscripts Department, the Southern Historical Collection (SHC), the Southern Folklife Collection (SFC), General and Literary Manuscripts, or the University Archives in their most recent research project.

This use rate gap is due to the survey not being targeted to specific recipients who are likely users of the manuscript collections (scholars of the American South), as was the original 2004 survey. The idea was that a previously unknown group or groups of manuscript collection users might be revealed outside of the scope of scholars of the American South. However, the response rate to the survey was not sufficient to reveal such groups. It does, however, hint at this possibility as the manuscripts collection use rate for this “Other” group is 5.1% and not zero. It is certainly worth future attempts to try to better capture data on *all* users, and not merely where users are expected to be found.

The large difference in use rates is injurious to the analysis of the data and the purpose of the study. Further, for the respondents selecting multiple disciplines, none also selected “Other”. So there is no overlap of the listed disciplines with those respondents who selected “Other.” The two groups can be easily and conveniently separated (see Appendix C for a full list of the responding, but excluded departments). Therefore further analysis of the survey data will be restricted to only the those respondents selecting one or more of the listed departmental or program affiliations to better focus the study and better represent the users targeted by the study. Table 2, and all subsequent tables present only the data of these respondents from these listed disciplines.

**Table 2: Respondents by Department Affiliation and Academic Status**

<b>Department</b>	<b>% of total R</b>	<b>Total # R</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>% of F</b>	<b>Grad</b>	<b>% of G</b>
<b>African-American Studies</b>	3.2%	1	1	5.3%	0	0%
<b>American Studies</b>	6.5%	2	1	5.3%	1	8.3%
<b>Anthropology</b>	3.2%	1	1	5.3%	0	0%
<b>English</b>	19.4%	6	3	15.8%	3	25%
<b>Folklore</b>	3.2%	1	1	5.3%	0	0%
<b>History</b>	22.6%	7	2	10.5%	5	41.7%
<b>Journalism</b>	6.5%	2	2	10.5%	0	0%
<b>Public Health</b>	25.8%	8	6	31.6%	2	16.7%
<b>Religious Studies</b>	3.2%	1	1	5.3%	0	0%
<b>Sociology</b>	6.5%	2	1	5.3%	1	8.3%
	100%	31	19		12	
			61.29%	100%	38.71%	100%

F=Faculty G=Graduate Student R=all Respondents

With the “Other” category eliminated, certain rough parallels can be seen with the 2004 study. The ratio of responses in faculty (61.29%) versus graduate students (38.71%) roughly corresponds to Turi’s original study: faculty 55.1% and graduate students 44.9%, albeit with notably more faculty responding than graduate students. This is due to the suppressed graduate student response that resulted from the mass email not being sent to graduate students.

A notable exception is the unexpectedly large response from Public Health (25.8%). The unexpectedly large number of respondents affiliated with Public Health cannot be adequately explained. After this department, History and English are the largest responding departments, as with Turi’s 2004 study. The English department respondents were split 50/50 between faculty and graduate students, which was nearly the case in Turi’s 2004 study (56% faculty to 44% graduate students). The History department respondents are reversed from the 2004 study. Then, 71.4% were faculty and 28.6% were graduate students. In 2009, 28.6% were faculty and 71.4% were graduate students. The

response rate of graduate students, however, has been suppressed since graduate students were not a part of the mass email survey invitation.

## DEMOGRAPHICS

An examination of respondent use by each of the component collections that make up the Manuscript Department's holdings is delineated by Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Respondent Use and Non-Use of the Manuscripts Department's Collections**

Collection User	SHC	% of R	SFC	% of R	UA	% of R	GLM	% of R	MD	% of R
No	5	29.4%	14	82.4%	15	88.2%	15	88.2%	11	64.7%
Yes	12	70.6%	3	17.6%	2	11.8%	2	11.8%	6	35.3%
<u>Totals</u>	17	100%	17	100%	17	100%	17	100%	17	100%

R=Valid Respondents SHC=Southern Historical Collection SFC=Southern Folklife Collection UA=University Archives  
GLM=General and Literary Manuscripts MD=Indeterminate use of the "Manuscripts Department"

In descending order of use, 70.6% of responding scholars used the Southern Historical Collection (compared with 41.4% in 2004), 17.6% had used the Southern Folklife Collection (17.2% in 2004), 11.8% had used General and Literary Manuscripts (17.2% in 2004), and 11.8% had used the University Archives (6.9% in 2004). Once again, the ratios are roughly the same as the 2004 study, but the Southern Historical Collection holds an even greater share of the reported use. Possibly, amongst all the component collections, the Southern Historical Collection has been the most successful in raising its profile over the last five years. An alternative explanation for the relative increase in the Southern Historical Collection's use is the larger percentage of History graduate students respondents in the 2009 study. History graduate students made up 15.4% of the graduate student respondents in 2004. In 2009, this figure was 41.7%. Graduate students training to be scholars of the American South often attend the

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill specifically to have access to the Southern Historical Collection.

In a notable departure from the 2004 survey, only 41.7% of respondents used a single collection (75% in 2004). In all instances where only a single collection was used, this collection was invariably the Southern Historical Collection. All other collections were always used in conjunction with at least one other collection. Of respondents who used multiple collections, 42.9% used only the Southern Historical Collection and the nebulous Manuscripts Department, while 28.6% used three collections, and 28.6% used four collections.

Examining the collection-using respondents by University status (tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty, and graduate students) shows 45% tenured faculty, 36% graduate students, and 9% non-tenured faculty. Unfortunately, an additional 9% stated neither tenure status nor university employment status. Leaving that unknown aside, the percentages are roughly proportionate to the findings of Turi's 2004 study: 62.5% were tenured faculty, 25% were graduate students, and 12.5% were non-tenured faculty or research staff. The 2009 study finds a higher percentage of graduate students and fewer tenured faculty. Correlating use of the individual collections with University status, these proportions held roughly true only for the Southern Historical Collection. The General and Literary Manuscripts were only used by tenured faculty, and the University Archives were only used by graduate students. The Southern Folklife Collection was used equally by graduate students and tenured faculty, the same finding in Turi's 2004 survey.

Tenured faculty are not the majority of collection users as they were in 2004,

which reported tenured faculty use ranging from 80% to 100%, with the SFC exception mentioned above. In 2009, the comparative range dips from 100% to as low as 45.5%.

**Table 4: Collection Users and Their Academic Status at UNC**

User Status	SH C	% of C	SFC	% of C	UA	% of C	GLM	% of C	MD	% of C
<b>G</b>	4	36.4%	1	33.3%	1	50.0%	0	0%	1	20.0%
<b>NTF</b>	1	9.1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>TF</b>	5	45.5%	1	33.3%	0	0%	2	100%	3	60.0%
<b>unknown</b>	1	9.1%	1	33.3%	1	50.0%	0	0%	1	20.0%
<b>Totals</b>	11	100%	3	100%	2	100%	2	100%	5	100%

C=Collection Users G=Graduate Student NTF=Non-Tenured Faculty TF=Tenured Faculty

In Turi's 2004 study, collection use was not only skewed to tenured faculty, it was skewed to "quite senior" faculty, the majority having received their last degree before 1981. In the 2009 study, the tenured faculty no longer dominate collection use. In addition, the tenured faculty have gotten younger. In 2004, the median year was 1970 for the last degree obtained. The current study found a median year of 1989 for tenured faculty, and a median year of 1997.5 for the combination of tenured faculty, non-tenured faculty, and graduate students. There is a single outlier of 1970, but otherwise, the most distant year a collection user obtained their last degree was 1989. This represents a large generational shift in use from Turi's study. To explain the difference, there either must have been some loss of older faculty in the last five years, or possibly, older faculty may still be present, but are more likely to participate in a mailed, paper-based survey than in an online survey sent via email. Or conversely, younger faculty are more likely to respond to an online survey than older faculty. Comparing the two studies by decade shows there are no respondents from the current study whose last degree was obtained in the 1960s, while almost a third of Turi's respondents are in this category.

This would be excellent news for the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill manuscript collections, as this appears to mean that younger faculty are using the collections, and use is not dying off with the retirement of older faculty used to paper-only archives and the rise of younger faculty more familiar and comfortable with online research. See Table 5 below for a complete breakdown.

**Table 5: Collection Users by Last Decade of Formal Education**

	SHC	% of C	SFC	% of C	UA	% of C	GLM	% of C	MD	% of C	Totals	% of TU
<b>1960s</b>	1	8.3%		0%		0%		0%		0%	1	8.3%
<b>1970s</b>	0	0%		0%		0%		0%		0%	0	0%
<b>1980s</b>	3	25.0%	1	33.3%		0%	2	100%	2	33.3%	3	25.0%
<b>1990s</b>	4	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	50.0%		0%	2	33.3%	4	33.3%
<b>2000s</b>	4	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	50.0%		0%	2	33.3%	4	33.3%
<b>Totals</b>	12	100%	3	100%	2	100%	2	100%	6	100%	12	100%

C=Collection Users TU=Total Users SHC=Southern Historical Collection SFC=Southern Folklife Collection UA=University Archives GLM=General & Literary Manuscripts MD=Indeterminate use of the "Manuscripts Department"

In reviewing the departmental affiliation of collection users, there is one major difference between the 2009 and 2004 survey. The 2009 online survey mistakenly did not have users indicate both *all* of their departmental affiliations, and simultaneously their *primary* affiliation. Turi's study reviewed use by the collection user's *primary* departmental affiliation. Table 6 below covers *all* affiliations listed by collection users. Since 25% of users listed more than one departmental affiliation and 75% listed only one affiliation, there are more affiliations than users. This creates the illusion of the number of users adding up incorrectly.

As in the 2004 study, the bulk of collection users come from the English and History departments, with their faculty and graduate students accounting for 83% of users. In 2004, the figure was 56.3%. American Studies is the next largest group, with 16.7%. In 2004, the next largest group was Folklore with 12.5%. The remainder is evenly split between African-American Studies, Anthropology, Folklore, and Religious Studies.

In an interesting reversal of findings from the original study, all of this sub-group of users utilized multiple collections.

The total number of different *primary* departmental affiliations reported by collection users in 2004 was higher than *all* of the departmental affiliations reported by collection users in 2009. This appears to indicate manuscript collection use is contracting to its core of History and English. No users reported affiliations with the departments of Geography, Music, or Political Science as were reported in 2004. However, there were responses from American Studies and Religious Studies, two departments that were not represented in 2004.

However, if use is not spread as widely across different departments as was true in 2004, in 2009 use is spread more widely across multiple collections, with one notable exception. All English department-affiliated users utilized only a single collection: the Southern Historical Collection. Turi's study notes "The remaining three scholars whose use has a collection spanning quality are drawn from the senior faculty members of the English and History Departments."<sup>28</sup> While the History department spans multiple collections despite senior faculty absence from the study, the same is not true of the English department. It appears that the loss of senior faculty since 2004 has curtailed multiple collection use.

In 2009, of the component collections, the Southern Historical Collection is the most widely used across departments, as it was used by every reporting department, and further, by every collection user. The Southern Folklife Collection and General and Literary Manuscripts were each used by four different departments. The University Archives were used only by the History Department and only in conjunction with other



collections. However, one must bear in mind these numbers are somewhat distorted as a single person could represent multiple departments.

**Table 6: Collection Users by Academic Department Affiliation**

Departments	SH C	% of C	SF C	% of C	U A	% of C	GL M	% of C	M D	% of C	User	% of TU
<b>African-American Studies</b>	1	6.3%		0%		0%		0%	1	14.3%	1	8.3%
<b>American Studies</b>	2	12.5%	1	20.0%		0%	1	25.0%		0%	2	16.7%
<b>Anthropology</b>	1	6.3%	1	20.0%		0%	1	25.0%		0%	1	8.3%
<b>English</b>	4	25.0%		0%		0%		0%		0%	4	33.3%
<b>Folklore</b>	1	6.3%	1	20.0%		0%	1	25.0%		0%	1	8.3%
<b>History</b>	6	37.5%	2	40.0%	2	100%		0%	5	71.4%	6	50.0%
<b>Religious Studies</b>	1	6.3%		0%		0%	1	25.0%	1	14.3%	1	8.3%
<b>Totals</b>	16	100%	5	100%	2	100%	4	100%	7	100%	12	

C=Collection Users TU=Total Users SHC=Southern Historical Collection SFC=Southern Folklife Collection UA=University Archives GLM=General & Literary Manuscripts MD=Indeterminate use of the "Manuscripts Department"

## USE AND NON-USE

It is in the analysis of the non-users that the differences in methodology between the 2004 study and this current study provoke the most concern. Turi's targeted, paper-based surveys drew responses describing both use and non-use from within the same academic disciplines. Unfortunately, the 2009 survey did not. The data show no overlap of use and non-use within disciplines. Oddly, the data shows that all the respondents from any given department were either all collection users or all collection non-users. The disciplines represented solely by collection users were: African-American Studies, American Studies, Anthropology, English, Folklore, History, and Religious Studies. The disciplines represented solely by collection non-users were: Journalism, Public Health, and Sociology.

This anomaly could be explained by a discipline being represented in the survey by a single respondent. However, only the disciplines of African-American Studies, Anthropology, Folklore, and Religious Studies were so represented. Thus this explanation does not suffice completely. Any survey is highly dependent on the whims of the recipient for completion. A mass email asking someone to complete an online survey

is perhaps even more so. A recipient is more likely to complete the survey if it has some relevance to them. Thus, a survey asking about collection use is more likely to be completed by a recipient who uses the collections. A recipient who does not use collections will see the survey as not relevant to them, and ignore it. Unfortunately, this survey was intended to be as much about non-use as use, and the input of non-users was equally valuable to users.

A paper-based survey with a personalized cover letter delivered by mail puts more of a social onus on the recipient to complete and return it. Email, with its high levels of spam, weighs less on a recipient's conscience, and may be considered more ignorable. A physical object has more gravitas, counteracting a recipient's initial dismissal of the survey as irrelevant. However, younger generations who have been raised on electronic forms of communication may not consider paper-based mail any more or less important than electronic mail.

**Table 7: Collection Non-Users by Academic Status**

<b>Non-User Status</b>	<b>All Manuscript Collections</b>	<b>% of Non-Users</b>
<b>Graduate Student</b>	2	25.0%
<b>Non-Tenured Faculty</b>	2	25.0%
<b>Tenured Faculty</b>	4	50.0%
<b>Totals</b>	8	100%

Whereas Turi's study was able to compare apples with apples, when it comes to collection non-users, this survey is stuck attempting to compare apples and oranges. Turi was able to gather useful data from non-collection using respondents of the same department as the users. He was also able to gather useful data on non-use on each of the component collections. This 2009 survey did not gather such useful data. In fact it was not useful to break down collection non-users by academic status (Table 7) by component

collection, as in Turi's study. The numbers were identical for each component collection: 50% are tenured faculty, 25% are non-tenured faculty, and 25% are graduate students. These are very different numbers from Turi's 2004 study, in which 69.2% of the non-users were graduate students, 15.4% were tenured faculty and 15.4% were non-tenured faculty or research staff. Rather than reflecting an actual shift of non-use from graduate students to tenured faculty, these numbers very likely reflect the inadequacy of the survey methodology to accurately capture data on non-use from the targeted academic disciplines, combined with the suppression of the graduate student response. The fact that the collection non-users come from completely different departments than the collection users supports this assertion.

**Table 8: Collection Non-Users by Academic Department Affiliation**

<b>Responder's Department</b>	<b>All Manuscript Collections</b>	<b>% of Non-Users</b>
<b>Journalism</b>	2	25.0%
<b>Public Health</b>	4	50.0%
<b>Sociology</b>	2	25.0%
<b>Totals</b>	8	100%

Non-use was represented entirely by only three of the targeted academic disciplines: Journalism, Public Health, and Sociology. Public Health made up 50% of the non-users. Journalism and Sociology each made up 25% of the non-users. Obviously, these numbers are a low point in the accuracy of this survey. There are surely members of the Journalism, Public Health, and Sociology departments that *do* use the manuscript collections, and there are surely members of the African-American Studies, American Studies, Anthropology, English, Folklore, History, and Religious Studies that *do not* use the manuscript collections. However, data indicating either has escaped the grasp of this

particular survey, and points to the difficulties of both reaching the desired survey population, as well as the difficulties of measuring non-use as opposed to use. Non-users overwhelmingly described their non-use as typical of their own research practices (75%), and typical for scholars of their academic discipline (87.5%). This gap between 100% non-use and less than 100% perceived typicality for the discipline further bolsters that there *are* collection users within these seemingly non-collection using disciplines.

As to why non-users do not use the manuscript collections, they almost uniformly responded with “not relevant” or a near-variant to the question: “Briefly describe why you have not used primary source materials from the Manuscripts Department, the Southern Historical Collection (SHC), the Southern Folklife Collection (SFC), General and Literary Manuscripts, or University Archives in your most recent research project?”

### **USE AND NON-USER FAMILIARITY**

This survey attempts to obtain only a simple understanding of a respondent’s familiarity with the various research collections at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The question used to determine this is “Are you familiar with the following research collections? Please check all options that are relevant.” Thus, “familiarity” is a definition left up to each respondent to decide for his or her self. Familiarity could vary as widely as “have heard of” to “intimately familiar with.” The survey goal is to determine the public profile of the component collections within the targeted disciplines, and not to plumb the subtleties of a scholar’s familiarity.

This respondent data is affected by a methodology problem that affects the data. The online survey, unlike the 2004 survey, did not allow respondents to simultaneously

select all discipline affiliations and denote a single primary affiliation. Therefore this table treats each respondent with multiple disciplines as a separate respondent for each discipline indicated. Disciplines represented by a single respondent have especially misleading results- Folklore, Anthropology, and Religious Studies all appear to be 100% familiar with all component collections due to this issue.

In descending order of familiarity across all targeted respondents, 70.8% were familiar with the Southern Historical Collection, 62.5% were familiar with the so-called Manuscripts Department, 54.2% were familiar with the University Archives, 41.7% were familiar with the Southern Folklife Collection, and 25% were familiar with the General and Literary Manuscripts. The results of Turi's 2004 study were: 89.7% familiar with the SHC, 37.9% familiar with the SFC, 37.9% familiar with the UA, and 31.0% familiar with the GLM. As with Turi's study, the SHC remains the collection with the most familiarity, and the GLM remains the collection with the least familiarity.

**Table 9: Familiarity with Manuscript Collections by Department Affiliation**

Departments	SH C	% of DR	SFC	% of DR	UA	% of DR	GL M	% of DR	MD	% of DR	TR	% of TU
African-American Studies	1	100%		0%		0%		0%	1	100%	1	4.2%
American Studies	2	100%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	2	100%	2	8.3%
Anthropology	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	4.2%
English	4	100%	2	50.0%	3	75.0%		0%	3	75.0%	4	16.7%
Folklore	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	4.2%
History	6	100%	4	66.7%	5	83.3%	2	33.3%	6	100%	6	25.0%
Journalism		0%		0%		0%		0%		0%	2	8.3%
Public Health		0%		0%	1	25.0%		0%		0%	4	16.7%
Religious Studies	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	4.2%
Sociology	1	50.0%		0%		0%		0%		0%	2	8.3%
<b>Total Respondents</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>70.8%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>41.7%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>54.2%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>25.0%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>62.5%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>

DR=Departmental Respondents TU=Total Users SHC=Southern Historical Collection SFC=Southern Folklife Collection UA=University Archives GLM=General & Literary Manuscripts MD=Indeterminate use of the "Manuscripts Department"

Primarily due to the previously noted failure to gather data on both users and non-users within any particular discipline, there exists a huge gap in the familiarity of users

and non-users. Non-users had exceptionally poor familiarity with any of the component collections. Only 12.5% of non-users were familiar with the SHC and the UA. These are the *highest* numbers; non-users had zero familiarity with the SFC, GLM, or even the obsolete term Manuscripts Department. This skews all the figures for total respondents lower.

On a side note, non-users had high familiarity with both the Carolina Population Center Library (75%) and the Odum Institute Data Archive (62.5%), which initially appears to indicate the primacy of these collections in these disciplines' research. However, this theory is somewhat undercut by the actual indicated use of the collections, 37.5% for the Carolina Population Center Library and 12.5% for the Odum Institute Data Archive.

If non-users are excluded, and only the familiarity of collection users examined, the percentages rise significantly: 100% were familiar with the SHC, 93.8% were familiar with the Manuscripts Department, 75% were familiar with the UA, 62.5% were familiar with the SFC, and 37.5% were familiar with the GLM.

**Table 10: Familiarity with Manuscripts Department Collections by Academic Status**

Respondent Status	Familiar with Manuscripts Collection										
	SHC	% of SG	SFC	% of SG	UA	% of SG	GLM	% of SG	MD	% of SG	TR
Graduate Student	4	66.7%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	0	0%	4	66.7%	6
Faculty	7	58.3%	4	33.3%	6	50.0%	3	25.0%	6	50.0%	12
Unknown	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	1	50.0%	2	100%	2
Totals	13	65.0%	7	35.0%	9	45.0%	4	20.0%	12	60.0%	20

TR=Total Respondents SHC=Southern Historical Collection SFC=Southern Folklife Collection UA=University Archives  
GLM=General & Literary Manuscripts MD=Indeterminate use of the "Manuscripts Department"

When all targeted respondents' university status is cross-tabulated with collection familiarity, the SHC had 66.7 % familiarity with graduate students and 58.3% familiarity with all faculty. Faculty were also less familiar with the now defunct Manuscripts

Department (50%) than graduate students (66.7%). Perversely, while faculty were less familiar with the SHC than graduate students, faculty showed superior familiarity over graduate students with all other collections: 50% versus 16.7% for the UA, 33.3% versus 16.7% for the SFC, and 25% versus 0% with the GLM. It seems unlikely that faculty would be *more* familiar with all SFC, UA, and GLM, and then simultaneously *less* familiar with the campus' best known collection, the SHC. These strange results disappear when non-users are subtracted, because non-user respondents skew heavily toward faculty with a 4:1 ratio of faculty to graduate students, and also have extremely low rates of collection familiarity. Examining collection users alone, equivalent familiarity rates are found with the SHC and Manuscripts Department between faculty and graduate students (100%), followed by superior faculty familiarity with the remaining collections: 83.3% versus 25% for the UA, 66.7% versus 25% for the SFC, and 50% versus 0% for the GLM. This is much more consistent with Turi's 2004 findings than when users and non-users are viewed as a group.

**Table 11: Familiarity with the Collections by Collection Use**

Collection use?	Respondents familiar with collections					
	SHC	SFC	UA	GLM	MD	TR
No	12.5%	0%	12.5%	0%	0%	8
Yes	100%	58.3%	66.7%	25.0%	91.7%	12
% of TR	65.0%	35.0%	45.0%	15.0%	55.0%	20

TR=Total Respondents SHC=Southern Historical Collection SFC=Southern Folklife Collection UA=University Archives  
GLM=General & Literary Manuscripts MD=Indeterminate use of the "Manuscripts Department"

As previously stated, there is a wide gap in familiarity between non-users and users in this survey, an issue caused or complicated by the fact there is no overlap in the departmental affiliation of users and non-users. This makes comparison between the 2004 numbers and the 2009 numbers for familiarity with the collections by collection use difficult, if not impossible. It is clear however, that the Southern Historical Collection is

well known by users of any manuscript collection, and the General and Literary Manuscripts are least known, and would benefit the most any publicity campaign.

### USE AND NON-USE BY MATERIAL TYPES

This survey attempts to determine the types of materials used by respondents in their most recent research project. Research materials were grouped into four categories: published primary source materials, unpublished personal and family papers, unpublished corporate or organizational records, and researcher mediated materials. See Appendix C for a complete list of research material types within the survey instrument. Looking at all respondents and comparing the same data from 2004, 95% used published primary source materials versus 100% in 2004, 70% used unpublished personal primary materials versus 68.9% in 2004, 40% used unpublished corporate primary materials versus 24.1% in 2004, and 60% used researcher-mediated materials versus 37.9% in 2004.

**Table 12: Use of Primary Source Material Types by Collection Use and Non-Use**

Collection Use?	Did Respondent Use Material Type?			
	Published	Personal/Family	Corporate/Org.	Researcher-Mediated
<b>No</b>	87.5%	25.0%	25.0%	75.0%
<b>Yes</b>	100%	100%	50.0%	50.0%
<b>% of respondents</b>	95.0%	70.0%	40.0%	60.0%

When comparing these figures to those of 2004, there are interesting similarities and differences. In both studies, there is unsurprisingly a higher percentage of use amongst collection users than collection nonusers. Also unsurprisingly, 100% of collection users across both studies used published materials and unpublished personal/family materials. In 2009, 87.5% of collection non-users used published



materials, as opposed to 100% in 2004; however, this gap may be explained by a single non-user respondent simply skipping the source material use questions. The lowest percentage for both 2004 and 2009 is corporate/organizational use, but 2009 shows a notable increase in use between both collection users (2004: 25%, 2009: 50%) and non-users (2004: 15.4%, 2009: 25%). The most significant change between the two studies lies in the use of researcher-mediated materials. In 2004, there was a near-identical low use rate of researcher-mediated materials for both collection users and non-users: 38.5% versus 37.5%. In 2009, there is a significant increase in researcher-mediated material use among both non-users (75%), and users (50%). This is likely at least partially explained by the fact of all non-users belonging to completely different academic disciplines. These disciplines (Journalism, Public Health, and Sociology) rely much more heavily on the types of research materials that fall under the category of researcher mediated materials: survey data, interviews, case studies, and field research. This is further bolstered by examining the specific type of researcher mediated materials most used by collection users and non-users. Users strongly favor interviews, with a 50% usage rate for this specific material type. Non-users strongly favor survey data, with a 75% usage rate. While this explains the higher non-user usage rate, it does not explain the higher usage rate of collection users, but may point to an increase in use of this type of material since the previous survey.

An additional trend may be an increase in the use of corporate and organizational materials by researchers, as this usage rate has increased significantly from 31.3% to 50%. As with the 2004 study, no collection-using respondent used corporate materials in isolation from personal/family materials.

Comparing use of research materials in general with use of research materials drawn from the manuscripts collections, a better picture can be created of the contribution the manuscripts collection made to respondents' most recent research project. Overall, collection users had a 75% usage rate for published primary source materials from the manuscripts collections, a 91.7% usage rate for unpublished personal and family papers from the manuscripts collections, and a 50% usage rate for unpublished corporate or organizational records. This means collection-using respondents are utilizing primary source materials types at near-equivalent rates from the manuscripts collections as from any other source.

### **USE AND NON-USE TYPICALITY**

The survey recipients were asked if their research practices on their most recent research project were typical of both their own personal research practices, as well as typical "of other scholars working in your academic discipline." Of all respondents, 72.7% reported their practices as typical of their past practices and 81% reported their practices as typical of scholars in their discipline. When collection users and non-users are examined separately, the numbers deviate little: 75% of users reported their practices as typical of their past practices and 81.8% reported their practices as typical of scholars in their discipline. Nonusers show a slightly higher rate of typicality within their discipline; 75% of nonusers reported their practices as typical of their past practices and 87.5% reported their practices as typical of scholars in their discipline.

Overall, this is consistent with the percentages reported in the 2004 study, which for all respondents were 73.1% for past practices, and 72.4% for peers. Examining collection users alone, the 2004 study found users reporting slightly higher rates of

research typicality: 81.3% for past practices and 89.5% for peers. A much larger gap is shown in the numbers presented by nonusers in 2004: 61.5% for past practices, and 60% for peers. This is very likely to the fact that the non-collection-using respondents in this survey come from completely different academic disciplines than the collection users.

### **USE SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPORTANCE**

The significance of a scholar's use of the manuscript collections in their research is measured with two survey questions. The first uses a simple Likert scale with which collection users rank the importance of the manuscripts collections in their most recent research project as either "Very Important," "Important," "Somewhat Important," or "Not Important." A separate survey questions asks respondents if they actually cited any of the manuscript materials in their most recent research project.

Analyzing the responses to these two questions shows the majority of collection-using respondents found them important in their research. All respondents who used the manuscript collections had cited them in their most recent project. Seventy-five percent of collection users rated them as "Important" or "Very Important" in their research. Only 25% rated them as "Somewhat Important," and zero percent rated them as "Not Important." These numbers have slipped approximately 10% since the 2004 study, which reported 85.7% of collection users rated the manuscripts collections as "Important" or "Very Important," and only 14.2% as "Somewhat Important."

Examining the users who rated the manuscripts collections as "Somewhat Important," reveals that 33.3% are from the English Department and 66% are from the History Department. These same users are 66.6% graduate students and 33% of an

undetermined University status. Their status as graduate students offers a more reasonable explanation than their academic department as to why they find the manuscripts only “Somewhat Important.” English and History are the disciplines with the highest use of the manuscripts collections, so it is somewhat surprising to find respondents from these departments rating them as only “Somewhat Important.” It may be that faculty of these departments have greater familiarity and appreciation for the manuscripts collections than graduate students.

**Table 14: Ranked Importance of Significance by Citation or Non-Citation of Manuscript Materials**

Cited Materials?	How Important a Role Did Manuscript Department Materials Play in Your Most Recent Project?							
	Not Important	% of C	Somewhat Important	% of C	Important	% of C	Very Important	% of C
No								
Yes	0	0%	3	25%	1	8.3%	8	66.7%

C=Collection Users

## RESEARCH PURPOSES, TIME FRAMES, AND SUBJECTS

Respondents were asked to classify their research project within the following four areas: “Research for Academic Coursework,” “Academic Research for Publication,” “Research for Thesis or Dissertation,” and “Academic Research for Presentation.”

Respondents were not limited to a single selection, but could select any multiple reasons for their research project. There was also an area for scholars to enter any other reason for their research, which was utilized by a single, non-collection-using respondent.

Examining respondents by the type of their research project, the data shows 70% of projects were for publication, 40% for a thesis or dissertation, 20% for academic coursework, and 25% were for some kind of instructional activity. These figures are all within 3% to 8% of their 2004 levels: 75.9% publication, 34.5% theses or dissertations, 27.6% coursework, and 17.2% instructional. This similarity is more surprising than not,

due to the much more lopsided ratio of graduate students to faculty that this study evinced. The research use of graduate students could reasonably be expected to generate higher rates for coursework and theses/dissertations whose absence would then show here in this study. Even more surprising, when the numbers are examined separately for collection users versus collection non-users, the similarities between the 2004 figures and the 2009 figures evaporate.

The rates of non-users show a theses/dissertation use drop from 80% to 37.5%, coursework use drop from 37.5% to 12.5%, publication use jump from 31.8% to 87.5% and instruction increase from zero to 25%. This can best be explained by the previously noted anomaly of non-using respondents being comprised of entirely different academic departments than those of collection users. They appear to have substantially different research reasons than the collection-using respondents.

However, the changes in project types reported by collection users between 2004 and 2009 are not as easily explained. Users display an increase in thesis/dissertation use from 20% to 41.7%, a drop in coursework use from 62.5% to 25%, a modest decline in publication use from 68.2 to 58.3%, and a startling plummet in instruction use from 100% to 25%. The lower rate of graduate student participation in this study may explain the substantial drop in the coursework figure, as graduate students attend many more classes than faculty. It cannot, however, adequately explain the decline in the publication figure, as it would be expected that faculty will publish more than graduate students. The Neither does it explain the increase in thesis/dissertation use, nor the sharp drop in instruction use. A more useful statistic would be to compare the research project types of collection users with those of the university as a whole, or by department, to see if users

are in line with the majority of their fellow scholars on campus, or evince a unique breakdown of research project types.

**Table 15: Research Project Genre by Collection Use and Non-Use Research Project**

Collection Use?	Research Project Genre				
	Thesis/Dissertation	Coursework	Publication	Instruction	Other
No	37.5%	12.5%	87.5%	25.0%	12.5%
Yes	41.7%	25.0%	58.3%	25.0%	0%
% of Total Respondents	40.0%	20.0%	70.0%	25.0%	5.0%

Turi's 2004 paper wrestled with an appropriate method for interpreting the research subjects of responding scholars. Given that respondents were able to freely respond to this open-ended question, and not limited to a set of checkboxes, it is no wonder that a highly varied set presented itself. Only after the surveys were returned and processed did Turi eventually settle on dividing them by the time period studied via the following categories: Pre-1800, 1800-1860, 1860-1900, 1900-1945, 1945-Present, and Longitudinal (spanning 100 years or more).

In hindsight, it would have been highly beneficial to alter the 2009 questionnaire to specifically ask what time frame or time frames respondents' most recent research project fell into. This change would not eliminate the question of research project topic, but instead augment it, aiding and speeding analysis.

**Table 16: Research Project Time Period by Collection Use and Non-Use**

Collection Use?	Research Project's Time Period					
	Pre-1800	1800-1860	1860-1900	1900-1945	1945-Present	Longitudinal
No					61.5%	
Yes		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	38.5%	100.0%
% of Total Respondents	0.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	65.0%	20.0%

Analyzing the research project time periods by use and non-use once again shows the distorting affects of the total divergence of academic departments between users and

non-users. The distortion here is severe; *all* of the non-users' most recent research projects fall into the time period of 1945 to present. This is little wonder, as the disciplines of Journalism, Public Health, and Sociology (the only disciplines represented by non-users) are much more concerned with recent issues than those of English, History, and American Studies (the disciplines of the majority of collection users). Observing the time frame breakdown of collection users, the majority of users' research projects also fell between the years 1945 to present, which was not true in Turi's 2004 study.

Comparing the research time frame of all respondents between the 2004 and 2009 studies shows reductions in most categories. The category for pre-1800 is 7.1% vs. 0%. In the 1800-1860 category it is 17.9% to 5%, in 1860-1900 it is 14.3% to 5%, in 1900-1945 it is 10.7% to 5%, in the 1945-Present category it is 32.1% to 65%, and under Longitudinal it is 17.9% to 20%, a slight increase. The 1945-Present category shows that the reductions in almost all other categories have been balanced by a large increase here. Even without the distortion caused by all non-users' research projects falling within the 1945-Present category, this category still contains the vast majority of research projects: 41.7%. The research time frame statistic is one that is least likely to be bound to another factor, and may truly present a change in use over time. The data show a marked increase in research projects dealing with the recent past at the expense of all other time periods. Longitudinal projects covering have maintained nearly the same ratio to the others as they did in 2004.

**Table 17: Research Topics Supported by Collection Use**

<b>User Research Topic and Interests</b>
Southern higher education history
African American higher education in North Carolina, roughly 1890-1930
Spiritualists in the Nineteenth-century South
Men's higher education in the antebellum South
Currently, I'm exploring the long reign of oral rhyming within African American culture, tracing the tradition from antebellum times through the present.
<b>No Response</b> - "American religious history, African American history"
Rhetoric of autism debates / Southern women's rhetorics
A social history of moviegoing in the South, particularly in Robeson County, NC.
<b>No Response</b> - "Currently working on a history of the Wilmington Ten."
investigation of the degree to which Lillian Hellman's life writing relies on her diaries and notes and the ways in which it uses and revises those notes
During Fall 2009 I am co-teaching a course on interpreting southern history from manuscripts with librarian [name redacted].
The North Carolina Fund and the War on Poverty

In table 18, respondents who did not respond to the “brief topical description” section have been noted with “no response.” Due to the relatively high rate of “no response” (37.5%), and to increase clarity and gain insight, this has been appended with the respondent’s response to the previous question of “Briefly describe your major academic and intellectual interest(s).”

Due to the dichotomy of academic disciplines between users and non-users in this 2009 iteration of the survey, comparison with the data from 2004 is problematic. Information on non-use by expected users is much, much more useful and desired than information on non-use from individuals not expected to use the manuscript collections. In 2004, only 53.8% of non-user respondents stated the collections were irrelevant to their topic. In 2009 respondents who did not use the manuscript collections provide a much more unanimous answer to the stated reasons for their non-use than those of 2004. Each answer is “not relevant” or a variant thereof, with the addition of one (12.5%) half-



hearted claim of ignorance of the collections: “Don’t know much about these...”<sup>29</sup> This much, or rather, this little, is comparable to the single non-user respondent (7.7%) proclaiming ignorance of the collections in 2004. Completely absent from these survey answers are any signs of future planned use of the manuscripts collections, a trait of 30.8% of non-user respondents in 2004.

An interesting side note is the brevity of the responses given in 2009 to this particular survey item. The average response was 7.5 words; in 2004 the average was 20 words. It may well be that respondents in the 2004 study felt a greater need to explain and/or justify their non-use of the manuscripts collections, as they came from the same departments (primarily English and History) and where use and familiarity of the manuscripts collections is more common.

**Table 18: Research Topics Not Supported by Collection Use with Respondent’s Reasons for Non-Use**

<b>Non-User Research Topic and Interests</b>	<b>Reason Given for Non-Use</b>
persuasive effects of advertising; particularly the role of trust in mediating advertising effectiveness	I don't do historical research
Development, choice, implementation, interpretation and application of epidemiologic methods	Not likely to contain relevant information
<b>No Response</b> - "Health insurance Medicaid policy mental health policy"	Don't know much about these and don't seem relevant to the research I do in health care
<b>No Response</b> - "Higher education- how it is impacted by race and SES. How contingent faculty perceive the culture at the institution."	Not relevant to my research
cost effectiveness, compliance with HIV treatment regimens in Kenya.	not relevant to topic.
<b>No Response</b> - "bio-medical science"	Because I use PubMed
founding team composition of new business ventures	they don't contain any information that would be useful to me
How socialization in family of origin affects young adults' own family formation	the materials there are irrelevant with my research

While there were some flaws in the 2009 survey methodology and a few in the survey instrument itself, there are a few areas of special interest in comparing the data from the two surveys. Turi’s data led him to conclude the manuscripts collections had an

older user base. This was a cause for concern, as there was no indication of a replacement for this fast-declining user base. The data from the 2009 survey paint a sunnier picture of a more youthful user base, which are likely to continue to use the collections for years to come. This data seems relatively unscathed by the problems with the methodology and implementation, although there is a possibility of bias with younger respondents more likely to respond to online surveys than older ones.

If the data is accurate, there is an area for concern regarding the level of diversity amongst different academic disciplines. In 2004, English and History Departments represented 66% of users. In 2009, they represent 83% of users, a significant increase at the expense of other disciplines. There are also fewer disciplines overall represented in this 2009 survey than in the 2004 survey. This leads to the conclusion of a drop in manuscript collection use by departments other than the core departments of English and History. However, survey methodology and implementation issues regarding this issue have muddied the water, and made this issue unclear.

Despite being initially excluded from the analysis, the set of respondents who did not select one of the listed departmental affiliations and instead selected “Other” should not be summarily dismissed. While including them in this study’s analysis would have made comparison with the 2004 survey data very problematic, this group warrants further study. They are not uniformly non-users of the manuscript collections, and further investigation may reveal previously unknown manuscript collection users that either are not scholars of the American South, or are a previously unregarded source of scholars of the American South. The data hints at the possibility in the 5.1% of this group who did use the manuscript collections. Half of these users cited the collection in their research,

and ranked the role played by the collection as important. The stated reasons for non-use are not uniformly negative, with one respondent in the process of planning future manuscript collection use: “I have actually identified sources to use through a catalog search, but have not yet had the time to make the trip over for an afternoon of research. Also, I never can remember what I can have with me and what I can't in terms of note-taking tools.”<sup>33</sup>. Also interesting are the statistics on the typicality of their non-use. They do not reflect the 5.1% use rate statistic. This group rates the typicality of their non-use to their own past research practices at 86.1% yes and 13.9% no. They rate the typicality of their own non-use to that of their discipline's scholars at 82.9% yes and 17.1% no. This seems to indicate that although a small but significant number did not use the manuscript collections for their most recent project, they did do so in past research projects. Perhaps the next iteration of this survey can be designed to better capture a respondent's use of manuscripts collections over multiple research projects.

### **LESSONS LEARNED**

“In our initial attempts at online surveying, we made mistakes but gained valuable insights from these mistakes.”<sup>32</sup> So, too did this study make mistakes, but gained insight. There are many areas for improvement. In the early stages of the survey, the best methods of approaching the intended survey population should be investigated beforehand. A back up plan for contacting the survey population should be made, with as much forethought and planning as the original. Both the 2004 and 2009 surveys utilized their backup plan to contact the survey population. Better knowledge and familiarity with online tools and their capabilities would have prevented several oversights in this 2009

survey. Familiarity with H-Net email list protocols would have assured a smoother announcement of the survey. Familiarity with the university's mass email tool would have assured it was sent to all graduate students. Familiarity with SurveyMonkey.com would have led to the creation of different collectors that would have easily determined how respondents came to the survey.

Even familiarity with all features of the SurveyMonkey.com system may not necessarily be a replacement for the practical experience of actually running a survey with it. Not all contingencies can be anticipated. One such issue that only came to light late in the analysis of the data was the case of seven respondents who skipped the question on whether they had used any of the manuscript collections. They counted as neither collection users nor non-users, and their data was not used. SurveyMonkey.com can forbid respondents from skipping a question by requiring them to answer before moving on to the next question. Proper use of this feature would have increased the response rate.

Another valuable lesson learned from utilizing an online survey is care is needed when converting an existing survey from one format to another, such as paper to online. It should be carefully checked that it is in fact collecting all of the desired data and data types exactly in the way of the original study. The 2009 study inadvertently neglected to allow respondents to indicate their primary departmental affiliation, and made comparison between certain parts of the 2004 and 2009 surveys muddled and difficult at best.

Repeated surveys, especially in their first few uses, should be reviewed before each reuse, to assure that all useful and necessary data is being collected and that no

useless or unneeded data is being collected. This 2009 survey would have benefited from asking respondents to select the date range of their research topics, instead of having to infer it from the topic itself. In addition, the survey asked at least one question for which the data was not analyzed, where respondents described the manuscript collection or collections they used. Reviewing surveys after each iteration makes them more efficient and prevents them from wasting respondents' time by asking unnecessary questions.

## CONCLUSIONS

The consensus is growing in archival literature that user studies are a necessity: "...archivists need a foundation of knowledge of who their users are and how the user community is composed."<sup>30</sup> It is argued that their primary purpose is in making a first, necessary step towards better serving users: "It is clearly time for the archival world to embrace user-oriented design. This is predicated upon knowing a good deal about users; and this can only come from conducting extensive, rigorous user studies...."<sup>31</sup> Much has been done towards the development of online tools to better serve archive users, from simply having an institutional webpage, to the development of Encoded Archival Description (EAD), to the implementation of social media and Web 2.0 tools. These tools have done much to improve patrons' access to information and archival materials.

Digital tools should also improve archivists and archives' ability to access information about their patrons. Use of a commercial online survey company is a viable avenue towards this goal, and the end goals of both this 2009 project and Turi's 2004 paper: to make user studies, in Turi's words, "...a manageable process that could be made workable within a typical institutional environment."<sup>34</sup> Online surveys offer a

cheap, easy, and effective alternative to time consuming paper-based surveys. Online survey companies offer a cheap, easy, and effective alternative to programming such Internet-based surveys in-house. Such ease should promote use, making it easier for busy archivists to conduct not just single, isolated user studies, but implement a regular user study regime. Making future user studies less arduous can go a long way to making them more regularized and toward overcoming what Conway referred to as the “problem of method.”

## END NOTES

1. Conway, P. L. (1994). *Partners in research: Improving access to the nation's archive: User studies of the National Archives and Records Administration. Archives & Museum Informatics*, i.
2. Samuel Smiles, quoted in: Bartlett, J. (1914). *Familiar quotations*. Boston: Little, Brown.
3. Conway, P. L. (1994). *Partners in research: Improving access to the nation's archive: User studies of the National Archives and Records Administration. Archives & Museum Informatics*, i.
4. Mortimer, I. "Discriminating between Readers: the case for a policy of flexibility," *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 23:1 (April 2002): 59-67.
5. Tibbo, H. (2002). Primarily history: Historians and the search for primary source materials. *International Conference on Digital Libraries -Proceedings of the 2nd ACM/IEEE-CS Joint Conference on Digital Libraries*, 1. Retrieved from The ACM Digital Library database.
6. Prom, C. J. (2002). The EAD Cookbook: A Survey and Usability Study. *The American Archivist*, 65(2), 266.
7. Bearman, D. (1994). Archival strategies. *American Archivist*, 58, 374-407.
8. Dowler, L. (1988). The role of use in defining archival practice and principles. *The American Archivist*, 51, 75.
9. Yeo, G. (2005). Understanding users and use: A market segmentation approach. *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 26(1), 26.
10. Dowler, L. (1988). The role of use in defining archival practice and principles. *The American Archivist*, 51, 77.

11. Turi, M. (2004). *Working on the South: A statistical description of scholarly use and non-use of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Manuscripts Department's collections*. (Master's paper, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, April 2004)  
Available from SILS Master's Paper Index (Record No. 2971), 10.
12. Dowler, L. (1988). The role of use in defining archival practice and principles. *The American Archivist*, 51, 77.
13. Conway, P. (1986). Facts and frameworks: An approach to studying the users of archives. *The American Archivist*, 49(4).
14. Conway, P. (1986). Facts and frameworks: An approach to studying the users of archives. *The American Archivist*, 49(4).
15. Krause, M. C. & Yakel, E. (2007). Interaction in virtual archives: the Polar Bear Expedition Digital Collections next generation finding aid. *The American Archivist*, 70(4), 287.
16. Conway, P. (1986). Facts and frameworks: An approach to studying the users of archives. *The American Archivist*, 49(4).
17. Evans, J. R. & Mathur, A. (2006). The value of online surveys. *Internet Research*, 15(2), 195-219.
18. Ritter, L. A. & Sue, V. M. (2007). Systematic planning for using an online survey. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 115, 19. Retrieved from Wiley InterScience database.
19. Manfreda, K. L., Bosnjak, M., Berzelak, J., & Haas, I. (2008). Web surveys versus other survey modes: A meta-analysis comparing response rates. *International Journal of Market Research*, 50(1), 93.



20. Singh, A., Taneja, A., & Mangalaraj, G. (2009). Creating online surveys: Some wisdom from the trenches. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 52(2), 197.
21. (2003). *H-Net Constitution*. Retrieved Oct. 1, 2009, from H-Net: Humanities and Social Sciences OnLine., Michigan State University, Michigan. Web site: <http://h-net.org/about/constitution.php>.
22. "I am affiliated with the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Yes/No"
23. Turi, M. (2004). *Working on the South: A statistical description of scholarly use and non-use of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Manuscripts Department's collections*. (Master's paper, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, April 2004), 11.
24. Ibid, 16.
25. Ibid, 16.
26. (2007). *H-Net Job Guide*. Retrieved Oct. 30, 2009, from H-Net: Humanities and Social Sciences OnLine, Michigan State University, Michigan.. Web site: <http://h-net.org/jobs/>.
27. Turi, M. (2004), 12. All references within this paper to statistics stated by Turi are from his 2004 paper.
28. Ibid, 22.
29. Quotation from survey respondent ID# 883346721.
30. Yeo, G. (2005). Understanding users and use: A market segmentation approach. *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 26(1), 26.

31. Tibbo, H. (2002). Primarily history: Historians and the search for primary source materials. *International Conference on Digital Libraries -Proceedings of the 2nd ACM/IEEE-CS Joint Conference on Digital Libraries*, 1. Retrieved from The ACM Digital Library database.
32. Singh, A., Taneja, A., & Mangalaraj, G. (2009). Creating online surveys: Some wisdom from the trenches. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 52(2), 197.
33. Quotation from survey respondent ID# 884487276.
34. Turi, M. (2004), 41

## APPENDIX A

Complete list of H-Net.org email lists to which the invitation was posted.

H-Afro-Am	African-American Studies
H-Appalachia	Appalachian History and Studies
H-CivWar	U.S. Civil War History
H-Education	History of Education
H-Folk	Research in Folklore and Ethnology
H-Judaic	Judaica, Jewish History
H-NC	North Carolina History and Culture
H-SAWH	Women and Gender in the U.S. South
H-SC	South Carolina History and Culture
H-Slavery	The History of Slavery
H-South	History of the United States South
H-Southern-Industry	History and Culture of Industrialization in the American South
H-Southern-Religion	Religion in the American South
PUBLORE	Public Sector Folklorists

## **APPENDIX B**

List of UNC-CH departments that were sent the mass email survey participation invitation:

Centers and Institutions  
Arts and Sciences  
School of Business  
School of Education  
School of Journalism  
School of Law  
School of Information and Library Science  
School of Social Work  
Continuing Education  
Libraries  
Graduate School  
School of Government  
School of Medicine  
School of Dentistry  
School of Nursing  
School of Pharmacy  
School of Public Health  
Vice Provost for Enrollment

# **APPENDIX C: All Responses of “Other” to Departmental or Program Affiliation(s)**

- |                                     |                                     |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Nursing                          | 27. Nursing                         |
| 2. Nursing                          | 28. Environmental Sciences and      |
| 3. Allied Health                    | Engineering                         |
| 4. Physics & Astronomy              | 29. Medicine                        |
| 5. pharmacy                         | 30. Dramatic Art                    |
| 6. Public Administration            | 31. Biochemistry and Biophysics     |
| 7. City and Regional Planning       | 32. Planning                        |
| 8. Dentistry- Periodontology        | 33. Biology                         |
| 9. Comparative Literature           | 34. LAW                             |
| 10. Dental                          | 35. Extension Division              |
| 11. Dentistry                       | 36. Mathematics                     |
| 12. School of Medicine              | 37. MHCH                            |
| 13. pediatric dentistry             | 38. Social Work                     |
| 14. Curriculum for the Environment  | 39. Art History                     |
| and Ecology                         | 40. Social Work                     |
| 15. medicine                        | 41. School of Government            |
| 16. Genetics                        | 42. School of Medicine              |
| 17. Psychiatry                      | 43. Information and Library Science |
| 18. Orthopaedics in the Medical     | 44. Psychology                      |
| School                              | 45. Pediatrics, school of medicine  |
| 19. Cell and Developmental Biology  | 46. School of Medicine              |
| 20. Medicine                        | 47. Education and Public Policy     |
| 21. medicine                        | 48. Chemistry                       |
| 22. Psychiatry - School of Medicine | 49. Communication Studies           |
| 23. ILS                             | 50. Finance                         |
| 24. Medicine                        | 51. law                             |
| 25. School of Dentistry             | 52. Exercise and Sport Science      |
| 26. Microbiology-Immunology         |                                     |

## **APPENDIX D: Cover Letter for H-Net & Mass Email**

Dear Scholar:

By way of a brief introduction, my name is Mike Childs. I am a graduate student in the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

I am conducting research in support of a master's paper, "Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the Manuscript Collections at the University Of North Carolina at Chapel Hill." This study is an attempt to better understand the factors that underlie academic use or non-use of the Southern Historical Collection (SHC) by UNC's scholars of the American South. Specifically, my research seeks to understand how a scholar's academic discipline, methodological choices, and research interests relate to their use or non-use of the materials held in the Southern Historical Collection. A richer understanding of the actual research needs and preferences of working scholars will aid SHC curators as they seek to acquire meaningful collections of manuscript materials.

The survey asks questions about your use of the SHC and other campus library resources, your scholarly discipline, career status, research interests, and research material predilections. It is designed to be completed in 10-15 minutes. Participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may choose not to answer any particular question or questions. Any information that you do elect to provide will be kept anonymous.

While no personally identifying information is collected, some questions or combination of questions may reveal information that could allow someone to deduce your identity. However, all information will be kept confidential, and after completion of the paper, all raw data will be destroyed. Also, you may choose not to answer any particular /question or questions.

This study has been approved by the Academic Affairs Institutional Review Board (AA-IRB) of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. All research on human volunteers is reviewed by a committee that works to protect your rights and welfare. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, or if you would like to obtain information or offer input, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at 919-966-3113 or by email to [IRB\\_subjects@unc.edu](mailto:IRB_subjects@unc.edu). Please refer to study 09-1574.

If you have any concerns, questions, or comments about this survey and the research study it supports, please feel free to contact me (by telephone (919) 259-1576 or email [tmike@email.unc.edu](mailto:tmike@email.unc.edu)) or my academic advisor, Matthew Turi at (919) 962-1345 or [turi@email.unc.edu](mailto:turi@email.unc.edu).

I sincerely hope that you will choose to participate in this study by completing this survey by October 20, 2009. Thank you for your consideration.

By clicking on the following link and completing the survey, I agree to be a participant in this research study:

[http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=0g1F7xVFwF19XyE9kaA\\_2bhw\\_3d\\_3d](http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=0g1F7xVFwF19XyE9kaA_2bhw_3d_3d)

T. Mike Childs, Graduate Student  
School of Information and Library Science  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
[tmike@email.unc.edu](mailto:tmike@email.unc.edu) or (919) 259-1576

## APPENDIX E: The Survey Instrument

### Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the

#### 1. Online Survey Introduction

Dear Scholar:

By way of a brief introduction, my name is Mike Childs. I am a graduate student in the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

I am conducting research in support of a master's paper, "Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the Manuscript Collections at the University Of North Carolina at Chapel Hill." This study is an attempt to better understand the factors that underlie academic use or non-use of the Southern Historical Collection (SHC) by UNC's scholars of the American South. Specifically, my research seeks to understand how a scholar's academic discipline, methodological choices, and research interests relate to their use or non-use of the materials held in the Southern Historical Collection. A richer understanding of the actual research needs and preferences of working scholars will aid SHC curators as they seek to acquire meaningful collections of manuscript materials.

The survey asks questions about your use of the SHC and other campus library resources, your scholarly discipline, career status, research interests, and research material predilections. It is designed to be completed in 10-15 minutes. Participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may choose not to answer any particular question or questions. Any information that you do elect to provide will be kept anonymous.

While no personally identifying information is collected, some questions or combination of questions may reveal information that could allow someone to deduce your identity. However, all information will be kept confidential, and after completion of the paper, all raw data will be destroyed. Also, you may choose not to answer any particular /question or questions.

This study has been approved by the Academic Affairs Institutional Review Board (AA-IRB) of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. All research on human volunteers is reviewed by a committee that works to protect your rights and welfare. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject, or if you would like to obtain information or offer input, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at 919-966-3113 or by email to [IRB\\_subjects@unc.edu](mailto:IRB_subjects@unc.edu). Please refer to study 09-1574.

If you have any concerns, questions, or comments about this survey and the research study it supports, please feel free to contact me (by telephone (919) 259-1576 or email [tmike@email.unc.edu](mailto:tmike@email.unc.edu)) or my academic advisor, Matthew Turi at (919) 962-1345 or [turi@email.unc.edu](mailto:turi@email.unc.edu).

I sincerely hope that you will choose to participate in this study by completing this survey by October 15, 2009. Thank you for your consideration.



**Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the**

**\* 1. I agree to be a participant in this research study:**

☐ Yes

☐ No

## Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the

### 2. Online Survey

You have declined to participate in this survey. Thank you for your time.

If you have reached this page in error, you may restart the survey by clicking the "next" button below. Otherwise you may close this browser window.

## Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the

### 3. Online Survey Introduction

**\* 1. I am affiliated with the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.**

☐ Yes

☐ No

## Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the

### 4. BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

What is your current employment status at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill? Please check all options and complete all blanks that are relevant.

**1. What is your current faculty status?**

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching Assistant     | <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Professor | <input type="checkbox"/> Professor Emeritus |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Research Assistant     | <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Professor |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lecturer               | <input type="checkbox"/> Professor           |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) |  |   |

**2. What is your tenure status?**

- |                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Tenured     | <input type="radio"/> Non-Tenure Track Faculty |
| <input type="radio"/> Non-Tenured | <input type="radio"/> Tenure Track Faculty     |

Number of Years until Tenure Review?

**3. What is your Department or Program affiliation(s):**

- |   |                                     |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> African-American Studies | <input type="checkbox"/> Economics  | <input type="checkbox"/> Music             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> American Studies         | <input type="checkbox"/> English    | <input type="checkbox"/> Political Science |
| <input type="checkbox"/> American Indian Studies  | <input type="checkbox"/> Folklore   | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Health     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Anthropology             | <input type="checkbox"/> Geography  | <input type="checkbox"/> Religious Studies |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Archaeology              | <input type="checkbox"/> History    | <input type="checkbox"/> Sociology         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Creative Writing         | <input type="checkbox"/> Journalism |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)   |                                     |  |

**Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the****5. EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT**

What is your current level of educational achievement? Please complete all blanks that are relevant.

**1. Bachelor's Degree**

Date Completed

Major

**2. Master's Degree**

Date Completed

Discipline

Major Field(s)

**3. Doctoral Degree**

Date Completed

Discipline

Major Field(s)

**4. Other Degree**

Degree Name

Discipline

Date Completed

Major Field(s)

**5. Other Degree**

Degree Name

Discipline

Date Completed

Major Field(s)

## Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the

### 6. EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

Graduate Degree(s) currently in progress. Please complete all blanks that are relevant.

#### **1. Master's Degree**

1st Year/2nd Year/Other   
 Discipline   
 Awarding Department(s)   
 Major Field(s)

#### **2. Additional Master's Degree**

1st Year/2nd Year/Other   
 Discipline   
 Awarding Department(s)   
 Major Field(s)

#### **3. Doctoral Degree**

Doing Coursework   
 ABD: Year Passed Exams   
 Discipline   
 Awarding Department(s)   
 Major Field(s)

#### **4. Other Additional Graduate Degree**

Degree Name   
 Progress in the Program   
 Discipline   
 Awarding Department(s)   
 Major Field(s)

## Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the

### 7. II. ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH INTERESTS

Please check all options and complete all blanks that are relevant.

**1. Briefly describe your major academic and intellectual interest(s):**

**2. Describe your current or most recent research project(s). What are the reason(s) for your research?**

☐ Research as a Part of Academic Coursework

☐ Research for a Thesis or Dissertation

☐ Academic Research for Publication

☐ Academic Research for Presentation

☐ Other Reason(s)

**3. Brief Topical Description:**

**4. Was your most recent research project completed over two years ago?**

☐ Yes

☐ No

## Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the

### 8. II. ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH INTERESTS

Please check all options and complete all blanks that are relevant.

**1. What types of primary sources have you used while working on your most recent research project?**

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Memoirs          | <input type="checkbox"/> Reports              | <input type="checkbox"/> Maps             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Document Sets    | <input type="checkbox"/> Advertisements       | <input type="checkbox"/> Video Recordings |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Literature       | <input type="checkbox"/> Government Documents | <input type="checkbox"/> Audio Recordings |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Histories        | <input type="checkbox"/> Pamphlets            | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Sets        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Periodicals      | <input type="checkbox"/> Posters              | <input type="checkbox"/> Musical Scores   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Newspapers       | <input type="checkbox"/> Laws and Regulations |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Source(s): |   |   |

**2. Unpublished Primary Source Materials: Personal or Family Materials**

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Diaries                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Original Writings  | <input type="checkbox"/> Ledgers                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Journals                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Wills              | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Financial                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Letters & Correspondence | <input type="checkbox"/> Deeds              | <input type="checkbox"/> Oral Histories                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Photographs              | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Legal Papers | <input type="checkbox"/> Blueprints & Technical Drawings |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Scrapbooks               | <input type="checkbox"/> Contracts          | <input type="checkbox"/> Audio-Visual Recordings         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)   |   |  |



## Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the

### 3. Unpublished Primary Source Materials: Corporate or Organizational Materials

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Correspondence   | <input type="checkbox"/> Reports        | <input type="checkbox"/> Blueprints and Technical Drawings |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Minutes          | <input type="checkbox"/> Photographs    | <input type="checkbox"/> Audio-Visual Recordings           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Papers | <input type="checkbox"/> Oral Histories |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal Papers     | <input type="checkbox"/> Contracts      |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Source(s): |   |  |

### 4. Other Primary Source Materials: Researcher Mediated Primary Source Material(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Survey Data      | <input type="checkbox"/> Case Studies   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Interviews       | <input type="checkbox"/> Field Research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Source(s): |   |

### 5. Is the mix of primary source materials that you used in your most recent research project typical of the research materials used by other scholars in your academic discipline?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If No, in what way do your primary source material choices differ from those of other scholars?

## Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the

### 9. III. MATERIAL AND COLLECTION USE

Please check all options that are relevant.

**1. Are you familiar with the following research collections? Please check all options that are relevant.**

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Carolina Population Center Library | <input type="checkbox"/> North Carolina Collection   | <input type="checkbox"/> Rare Book Collection                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Documenting the American South     | <input type="checkbox"/> North Carolina Gallery      | <input type="checkbox"/> Southern Folklife Collection (SFC)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General and Literary Manuscripts   | <input type="checkbox"/> Odum Institute Data Archive | <input type="checkbox"/> Southern Historical Collection (SHC) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Manuscripts Department             | <input type="checkbox"/> Photographic Archives       | <input type="checkbox"/> University Archives                  |

**2. Have you used primary source materials from the following research collections in your most recent research project? Please check all options that are relevant.**

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Carolina Population Center Library | <input type="checkbox"/> North Carolina Collection   | <input type="checkbox"/> Rare Book Collection                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Documenting the American South     | <input type="checkbox"/> North Carolina Gallery      | <input type="checkbox"/> Southern Folklife Collection (SFC)   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General and Literary Manuscripts   | <input type="checkbox"/> Odum Institute Data Archive | <input type="checkbox"/> Southern Historical Collection (SHC) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Manuscripts Department             | <input type="checkbox"/> Photographic Archives       | <input type="checkbox"/> University Archives                  |

**3. I have used primary source materials from the Manuscripts Department, the Southern Historical Collection (SHC), the Southern Folklife Collection (SFC), General and Literary Manuscripts, or University Archives in my most recent research project.**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

## Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the

### 10. III. MATERIAL AND COLLECTION USE

What types of primary sources from the Manuscripts Department, the Southern Historical Collection (SHC), the Southern Folklife Collection (SFC), General and Literary Manuscripts, or University Archives have you used while working on your most recent research project? Please check all options and complete all blanks that are relevant.

#### 1. Published Primary Source Materials:

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Memoirs        | <input type="checkbox"/> Literature           | <input type="checkbox"/> Maps             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Document Sets  | <input type="checkbox"/> Advertisements       | <input type="checkbox"/> Video Recordings |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Musical Scores | <input type="checkbox"/> Government Documents | <input type="checkbox"/> Audio Recordings |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Histories      | <input type="checkbox"/> Pamphlets            | <input type="checkbox"/> Reports          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Periodicals    | <input type="checkbox"/> Posters              |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Newspapers     | <input type="checkbox"/> Laws and Regulations |   |

☐ Other Source(s):

#### 2. Unpublished Primary Source Materials: Personal or Family Materials:

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Diaries                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Wills                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Artwork                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Journals                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Deeds                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Oral Histories                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Letters and Correspondence | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Legal Papers     | <input type="checkbox"/> Blueprints and Technical Drawings |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Photographs                | <input type="checkbox"/> Contracts              | <input type="checkbox"/> Audio-Visual Recordings           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Scrapbooks                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Ledgers                |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Original Writings          | <input type="checkbox"/> Other Financial Papers |  |

☐ Other Source(s):

## Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the

### 3. Unpublished Primary Source Materials: Corporate or Organizational Materials

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Correspondence   | <input type="checkbox"/> Reports        | <input type="checkbox"/> Blueprints and Technical Drawings |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Minutes          | <input type="checkbox"/> Photographs    | <input type="checkbox"/> Audio-Visual Recordings           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Papers | <input type="checkbox"/> Oral Histories |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal Papers     | <input type="checkbox"/> Contracts      |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other Source(s): |   |  |

### 4. Briefly describe the Collection(s) that contain the primary source materials that you selected above.

### 5. In aggregate, how important a role did the primary source materials that you selected above play in your most recent research project?

- |                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Very Important | <input type="radio"/> Somewhat Important |
| <input type="radio"/> Important      | <input type="radio"/> Not Important      |

### 6. Have you cited primary source materials from the Manuscripts Department, the Southern Historical Collection (SHC), the Southern Folklife Collection (SFC), General and Literary Manuscripts, or University Archives in your most recent research project?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

## Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the

### 11. V. COLLECTION ASSESSMENT

**1. Briefly describe why you have not used primary source materials from the Manuscripts Department, the Southern Historical Collection (SHC), the Southern Folklife Collection (SFC), General and Literary Manuscripts, or University Archives in your most recent research project?**



## Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the

### 12. IV. COLLECTION ASSESSMENT

**1. Is your use or non-use of the primary source materials of the Manuscripts Department, the Southern Historical Collection (SHC), the Southern Folklife Collection (SFC), General and Literary Manuscripts, or University Archives in your most recent research project typical of your past research practices?**

☐ Yes

☐ No

**2. Is your use or non-use of the primary source materials of the Manuscripts Department, the Southern Historical Collection (SHC), the Southern Folklife Collection (SFC), General and Literary Manuscripts, or University Archives in your most recent research project typical of the practice of other scholars working in your academic discipline?**

☐ Yes

☐ No

## Southern Fried Research: Scholarly Use and Non-Use of the

### 13. Thank You

Thank you for your the time.

\*\*\*\*\*

This study is surveying only scholars affiliated with the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Scholars not affiliated with University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill should not complete this survey.